

-12-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 13, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration. Claims 1-38 and 40 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 9, 28, 29, 37, 38 and 40 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claim 39 has been cancelled. Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants cancel claim 39.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Araujo, U.S. Patent No. 6,920,502. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Office makes a general allegation of anticipation with reference to Araujo, col. 1, line 1 through col. 11, line 67, col. 12, lines 1 through col. 13, line 5, col. 47, lines 60-67, col. 13, line 5 through col. 15, line 45, col. 15, lines 45-60, col. 18, lines 40-65, col. 17, lines 5-10, col. 17, lines 55-67, col. 19, lines 40-67, col. 20, lines 35-45, col. 22, lines 20-50, col. 22, lines 50 through col. 23, line 5, col. 33, lines 30-40, col. 23, lines 35-65, col. 29, lines 5-45 and col. 30, lines 20-25. The Office does not relate any of these references to the features of the claims, but lays out the workings of Araujo with reference to the cited text.

In response the Applicants respectfully submit that Araujo does not teach or suggest

receiving, from a device, a first message via a non-session based messaging protocol;

maintaining a session context that maps messages transferred from the device using the non-session based protocol to a session-based application controlled using a session-based protocol;

mapping the first message from the device using the non-session based messaging protocol to the session-based protocol using the maintained session context to allow the device to control the session-based application; and

mapping a second message received from the application using the session-based protocol from the session-based application to the non-session based protocol using the maintained session context to return at least a portion of the second message to the device.

as in claim 1. Likewise, Araujo does not teach or suggest the features of the remaining independent or dependent claims.

Further, it is noted that the Office Action fails to specifically address even the expressly recited features of the pending independent or dependent claims. Under the Office's policy of compact prosecution, each claim should be reviewed for compliance with every statutory requirement for patentability in the initial review of the application, even if one or more claims are found to be deficient with respect to some statutory requirement. (MPEP §707.07(g)). It is submitted that the present application is not sufficiently informal, does not present an undue multiplicity of claims, or exhibit a misjoinder of inventions, so as to reasonably preclude a complete action on the merits. Thus, it is submitted that the Office's failure constitutes a failure to expeditiously provide the information necessary to resolve issues related to patentability that prevents the Applicants from, for example, presenting appropriate patentability arguments and/or rebuttal evidence. (See The Official Gazette Notice of November 7, 2003). Additionally, it is submitted that the Office's failure needlessly encourages piecemeal prosecution, which is to be avoided as much as possible. (MPEP §707.07(g)). Accordingly, in the event that the Office maintains the rejection of any of the independent or dependent claims, Applicants respectfully requests, in the interests of compact prosecution, that the Office apply art against each feature of each rejected independent claim, on the record, and with specificity sufficient to support a prima facie case of anticipation.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

-14-

Summary

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston, Jr
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 55,394
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: NMS03-20

Dated: November 29, 2007